



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

74
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,071	08/06/2003	John Michael Kowalski	SLA.0187.1	7213
55376	7590	10/02/2006	EXAMINER	
ROBERT D. VARITZ 4915 S.E. 33RD PLACE PORTLAND, OR 97202			DINH, KHANH Q	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2151		

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,071	KOWALSKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Khanh Dinh	2151		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/6/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the preliminary Amendment filed on 8/6/2003. Claims 1-3 are cancelled. Claims 4-7 and new claims 8-10 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 8-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,410.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the reasons set forth below:

Regarding claim 8, claim 1 of the above patent recites all steps of claim 8 of the instant application. The claim 1 of the above patent does not recite correspondent method for the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that method (i.e., off-the-shelf method) must exist in the method for the system of claim 1 of the above patent to be performed.

Regarding claim 9, claim 2 of the above patent recites all steps of claim 9 of the instant application. The claim 2 of the above patent does not recite correspondent method for the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that method (i.e., off-the-shelf method) must exist in the method for the system of claim 2 of the above patent to be performed.

Regarding claim 10, claim 3 of the above patent recites all steps of claim 10 of the instant application. The claim 3 of the above patent does not recite correspondent method for the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that method (i.e., off-the-shelf method) must exist in the method for the system of claim 3 of the above patent to be performed.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of

obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In dependent claim 5, Applicant defines "a buffer size" as T (D); however, in the related independent claim 4, Applicant already defined T(D) as a **different term** as "a buffer delay".

6. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the product" and "the packet length" and "the number of packets" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Other prior art cited

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - a. Iuoras et al, US pat. No.6,445,707.
 - b. LeBlanc et al, US pat. No.6,990,195.
 - c. Le Blanc et al, US pat. No.6,980,528.
 - d. Rabenko et al., US pat. No.6,675,931.
 - e. Welck et al., US pub. No.2005/0055454 A1.
 - f. Abaye et al., US pat. No.7,024,475.
 - g. Graf, US pat. No.6,397,251.

Conclusion

8. Claims 4-10 are rejected.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to response within the period for response

will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U. S. C . Sect. 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



KHANH DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100